

## MINUTES

### UTAH ELECTRICIANS BOARD MEETING

MAY 17, 2007

ROOM 474 – 4<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR – 09:00 A.M.  
HEBER WELLS BUILDING  
160 East 300 South  
Salt Lake City, Utah

**CONVENED:** 09:04 A.M.

**ADJOURNED:** 11:43 A.M.

**DOPL STAFF PRESENT:** Dennis Meservy, *Bureau Manager*  
Wayne Holman, *Investigations Supervisor*  
Alan Dawes, *Acting Board Secretary*  
Lenore Epstein, *Attorney General's Office*

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Brad Stevens, *Chairman*  
Frank Rydalch  
David Kingery  
Howard Weight  
Dirk Burton

**EXCUSED:** Katie Tris, *Board Secretary*

**VISITORS:** Jason Ferguson, *Alliant Tech Systems (ATK)*  
Trina Hansen, *Ogden- Weber Applied Tech*  
Doug Leon, *Davis Applied Technical College*  
Dale Olson, *Utah Valley State College*  
Vern Petersen, *International Code Council*  
Will Pierce, *Salt Lake Community College*  
Lori Stewart, *Mountainland Applied Tech*

**MINUTES** Frank Rydalch made a motion to approve the minutes for the April 2007 Electricians board meeting. David Kingery seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

**JASON FERGUSON:** Jason Ferguson current employer is a licensed electrical contractor. The majority of Ferguson's experience, however, is maintenance work with unlicensed companies. The board needed additional information before they could determine if Ferguson should receive any credit towards his journeyman license for his electrical maintenance experience.

Ferguson had a verification form that was signed by Ron Daley, a former supervisor, he worked with doing electrical maintenance work. The board requested that Ferguson obtain a letter from Daley that specifically outlined his work experience. Also, Ferguson needed to go to an applied technical school and take a competency test. The documentation Ferguson provided to the board was returned to him.

## **ELECTRICAL RULES**

Lenore Epstein has been working on updating and clarifying the administrative rules for electricians. She passed out a draft of her work to the board and changes to the draft were discussed.

The board discussed low voltage. Low voltage work as defined by rule does not require licensing. Too many find the present definition of low voltage to be confusing. Also, the definition currently is allowing work that has the potential to be dangerous.

Wayne Holman brought up the use of nonmetallic sheathed cable as used in commercial projects. The Utah Construction trades licensing act 55-55-102(34) defines "Residential project," as it relates to an electrician or electrical contractor, means buildings primarily wired with nonmetallic sheathed cable, in accordance with standard rules and regulations governing this work, including the National Electrical Code, and in which the voltage does not exceed 250 volts line to line and 125 volts to ground." This definition in the act appears to be broader than what is reflected in the administrative rules and the board appeared to favor a stricter definition. This would require a change in the act or statute. Dennis Meservy mentioned the administrative rules needed to be in compliance with the act.

Dirk Burton mentioned excavation contractors were installing conduit in new subdivisions. Burton was informed, outside of electrical contractors, the conduit could be installed by E100 General Engineering or S410 Pipeline and Conduit contractors. Holman mentioned that other contractors installing conduit needed to be referred to him for investigation.

## **CONTINUING EDUCATION PROVIDERS**

Since, Katie Tris was not at the meeting it was unknown if Village Electric had provided any additional continuing education course material for the board to review.

Village Electric would be placed on the agenda for next month. The board received information from Adrian Steik and ElectricalCEU.com Corp requesting approval as a continuing education provider. The information from ElectricalCEU was received just that morning and was not an agenda item. The documentation will be reviewed by the board members and discussed at the June board meeting.

#### **CONTINUING EDUCATION AUDIT**

The board, after reviewing the results of their last random audit, were concerned. The majority of those audited after the first of the year have not responded. Penalties for those that do not respond include not being able to renew their electrical license when it comes due. Also, electrical contractors will not be able to renew their contractor licenses this fall if their qualifier has not responded. Electricians, in order to renew their licenses this past November, had to indicate they had completed their continuing education. In the audit process those found to have falsified their renewal application will be turned over to investigations. Harold Weight was of the opinion that every electrician should be required to submit proof of continuing education before they can renew their license. Meservy mentioned there is a lack of personnel and this would have an impact on online renewal. Also, just because someone does not respond to an audit letter does not mean they don't have the required continuing education. There are those in the industry that dislike regulation. The division has had problems with contractors that have insurance, but fail to provide proof to the division until a petition has been filed and a hearing has been scheduled. The electricians need a provision in their administrative rules that make it unprofessional conduct to not provide proof of continuing education when requested. Kingery mentioned from his experience the number of electricians taking continuing education over the years has dropped.

The board talked about having fine authority like the contractors. This would require a statute change by the state legislature. The contractors by statute or act have fine authority for not completing continuing education.

The board discussed targeting more master electricians hoping there would be a trickle down effect to their employees. Burton made a motion for the division to send out a second post-renewal audit that is directed towards master electricians and residential master electricians. Kingery seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

#### **EXAMINATION REVIEW**

The board reviewed the test scores from Thomson Prometric. The pass scores for the written examinations appear to be higher than in the past. Trina Hansen contributed this to the competency testing that is now being administered by the schools each semester. The board requested that Tris contact the various schools and request their latest competency test results.

The board was concerned about the high number of no shows to the hands-on practical examination. The percentage of no shows at the last test was twenty-six percent. One testing candidate has been on the testing list for months, but not once has appeared for the test. The current number of no shows is making other testing candidates wait longer than they should to test. The board discussed making a no show to the hands-on practical test count as a failure. Meservy was asked by the board to contact Thomson and find out their policy in dealing with no shows to the practical test. According to Thomson Prometric Candidate Information Bulletin, testing candidates, unless there is an emergency, lose their registration fee.

#### **APPLICATION REVIEW**

Board reviewed out of state applications.

**All business concluded, meeting adjourned.**

*Note: This report is not intended to be a verbatim transcript, but is intended to record the significant features of what was discussed in the meeting. Discussed items are not necessarily arranged in chronological order.*

(ss) Brad Stevens  
Board Chairperson

June 21, 2007  
Date

(ss)Dennis Meservy\_  
Bureau Manager

June 21, 2007  
Date